



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MW

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/441,628	11/16/1999	GREGORY H. PETRAK	39661.830001	4716
20686	7590	03/24/2004	EXAMINER	
DORSEY & WHITNEY, LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 370 SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 4700 DENVER, CO 80202-5647			LUONG, VINH	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3682		
DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/441,628	PETRAK, GREGORY H.
	Examiner Vinh T Luong	Art Unit 3682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/18/03 & 1/31/04.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 22-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 81-83 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,22-26,35-39,42-49,55-67 and 73-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 27-34,40,41,50-54 and 68-72 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



Vinh T. Luong  
Primary Examiner

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>36</u> . | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Attachment</u> .                       |

1. The Amendment filed on December 18, 2003 (Paper No. 35) has been entered.
2. The drawings were received on December 18, 2003. These drawings are accepted by the examiner.
3. Applicant's election without traverse of the species of Figs. 1-15 in Paper No. 6 of parent application is carried over to the instant Request for Continued Examination (RCE) Application.
4. Claims 81-83 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 6.
5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. Claims 1, 2, 22-26, 35-38, 45-49, 55, 56, 60-67, 73, 74, and 78-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wing (US Patent No. 4,624,155 cited by applicant).

Regarding claim 1, Wing teaches a park brake cable system comprising:

a brake actuation lever 20;

a connector clip 25 having a first end and a second end, and including a shear member 40, 45 having a shear failure force, positioned between the first end 47 (Fig. 3) and second end (at 13 in Fig. 1, see Att. and claims 1-5) of said connector clip 25;

a brake assembly 11, 12;

a front cable strand 23 having a first and second ends (see Attachment), the first end attached to the brake actuation lever 20, and the second end engaging the shear member 40, 45 on the connector clip 25;

a first rear cable strand 14 having a first end and a second end, the first end attached to the second end 13 of the connector clip 25 and the second end attached to the brake assembly 11; and

tensioner means 26-31, etc. (*id.*, line 24 *et seq.*, column 2) attached in a tension force transmitting relationship with the front cable strand 23 and the first rear cable strand 14, creating a continuous connection from the brake actuation lever 20 to the brake assembly 11, 12;

wherein applying tension to the front and first rear cable strands 23 and 14 by the tensioner means 26-31, etc. inherently creates at least the shear failure force to cause the second end of the front cable strand 23 to break the shear member 40, 45 and move to the first end of the connector clip 25, and maintain the continuous connection from the brake actuation lever 20 to the brake assembly 11, 12.

Claim 1 and other claims below are anticipated by Wing under the principle of inherency. The shear member 40, 45 is inherently broken if sufficient shear failure force is applied to it. Note that as a matter of fact, virtually any thing will break if enough pressure or force is applied to it. See "flexible" in *Fredman v. Harris-Hub Co., Inc.* 163 USPQ 397 (DC NIII 1969).

Regarding claim 2, actuating said tensioner means 26-31, etc. inherently develops a first tension level prior to breaking the shear member 40, 45, and a second residual tension level after breaking the shear member 40, 45.

Regarding claim 22, said connector clip 25 includes a main body 26 having an interior cavity (defined by arms 28 and 29, see Att.), and open first and second ends, and wherein at least a portion 50 of the shear member 40, 45 extends across a portion of the interior cavity.

Regarding claim 23, said at least a portion 50 of the shear member 40, 45 is a tab 41.

Regarding claim 24, the tab 41 includes a stress riser 43.

Regarding claim 25, said tab 41 has a front face and a rear face, the front face: (i) facing said first end of the first rear cable strand 23 (Figs. 2 and 3); and (ii) having a stress riser 43 disposed thereon, and the rear face being opposite said front face. Note that the tab 41 and the riser 43 are formed as one piece, therefore, the riser is disposed *on* the front/rear face of the tab.

Regarding claim 26, said tab 41 has a front face and a rear face, the rear face: (i) facing away from said first end of the first rear cable strand 14 and (ii) having a stress riser 43 disposed thereon, and the front face being opposite said rear face. See Att.

Regarding claim 35, said connector clip 25 comprises an elongated body 28, 29 defining an interior cavity and having first and second ends. (Att.)

Regarding claim 36, the first and second ends of the connector clip 25 are open. (Att.)

Regarding claim 37, at least a portion 40, 50 of the shear member 40, 45 extends into said interior cavity. (Att.)

Regarding claim 38, the portion 40, 50 of the shear member 40, 45 comprises a tab 41.

Regarding claim 45, Wing teaches a park brake cable system comprising:

a brake actuation lever 20;

a connector clip 25 having a first connector clip end and a second connector end, and including a shear member 40, 45 having a shear failure force, positioned between the first and second connector ends (id., claims 1-5);

a brake assembly 11, 12;

a front cable strand 23 having a first and second front cable ends (Att.), the first front cable end being attached to the brake actuation lever 20, and the second front cable end engaging *one of* the shear member 40, 45 and the first connector clip end;

a first rear cable strand 14 having a first rear cable end and a second rear cable end, the first rear cable end attached to one of the shear member 40, 45 and the second connector

clip end, only one of the second front cable end and the first rear cable end being attached to the shear member 40, 45; and

a tensioner means 26-31, etc. attached in a tension force transmitting relationship with the front cable strand 23 and the first rear cable strand 14, creating a continuous connection from the brake actuation lever 20 to the brake assembly 11, 12;

wherein applying tension to the front and first rear cable strands 23 and 14 by the tensioner means 26-31, etc. *inherently* creates at least the shear failure force to cause the one of the second front cable end and the first rear cable end attached to the shear member 40, 45: (i) to break the shear member 40, 45; and (ii) move to one of the first and second connector ends respectively, maintaining a continuous connection from the brake actuation lever 20 to the brake assembly 11, 12.

Regarding claims 46-49, see claims 22-25 above.

Regarding claims 55 and 56, see claims 35 and 2, above.

Regarding claim 60, the park brake cable system further comprises:

an equalizer structure 13, 34; and

a second rear cable strand 15, the second rear cable strand 15 having first and second ends;

wherein the brake assembly 11, 12 includes (i) a rear left brake 11, and (ii) a rear right brake 12, the first end of the second rear cable strand 15 being attached to the equalizer 13, 34, and the second end of the second rear cable strand 15 being attached to one of the rear left brake and the rear right brake 11 and 12, the second rear cable end of the first rear cable strand 14 being attached to the other of the rear left brake and the rear right brake 11 and 12.

Regarding claim 61, said tensioner means 26- 31, etc. is positioned on said equalizer 13, 34.

Regarding claim 62, said tensioner means 26-31, etc. is positioned *indirectly* on said brake actuation lever 20.

Regarding claim 63, Wing teaches a park brake cable system comprising:

a brake actuation lever 20;

a connector clip 25 having a first end and a second end, and including a shear member 40, 45 having a shear failure force, positioned between the first and second ends of said connector clip 25 (Att.);

a brake assembly 11, 12;

a front cable strand 23 having a first and second ends, the first end attached to the brake actuation lever 20, and the second end engaging the first end on the connector clip 25;

a first rear cable strand 14 having a first end and a second end, the first end attached to the shear member 40, 45 of the connector clip 25 and the second end attached to the brake assembly 11, 12; and

tensioner means 26-31, etc. attached in a tension force transmitting relationship with the front cable strand 23 and the first rear cable strand 14, creating a continuous connection from the brake actuation lever 20 to the brake assembly 11, 12;

wherein applying tension to the front and first rear cable strands 23 and 14 by the tensioner means 26-31, etc. *inherently* creates at least the shear failure force to cause the first end of the first rear cable strand 14 to break the shear member 40, 45 and move to the second end of the connector clip 25, and maintain the continuous connection from the brake actuation lever 20 to the brake assembly 11, 12.

Regarding claims 64-67, see claims 22-25 above.

Regarding claims 73 and 74, see claims 35 and 2 above.

Regarding claims 78-80, see claims 60-61 above.

Art Unit: 3682

9. Claims 39, 42-44, 57-59, and 75-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wing.

Regarding claim 39, the second end of the front cable strand 23 has a bead 48 attached thereto, and wherein a width of the bead 48 is greater than a diameter of the front cable strand 23 to which the bead 48 is attached.

Wing teaches the bead for the front cable strand. However, Wing does not teach the bead for the first rear cable strand 14. Wing taught or suggested the bead (48) for the cable strand (23) in order to attach the cable strand to other structure (*e.g.*, the element 45).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to form the bead for Wing's first rear cable strand 14 as taught or suggested by Wing in order to attach the rear cable strand 14 to the other structure, such as, the element 13 of the connector clip 25.

Regarding claims 42-44, 57-59, and 75-77, Wing teaches the invention substantially as claimed. However, Wing does not teach the claimed dimensions, such as, the first tension level ranges from 160 to 250 pounds, the second residual tension level ranges from 90 to 130 pounds, and the distance the second end of the front cable strand moves ranges from 13 to 25 millimeters.

It is common knowledge in the art to choose the ranges as claimed in order to improve the movements of the brake cable system. See legal precedents about optimization of ranges in MPEP 2144.05 and changes in size/proportion in MPEP 2144.04.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to choose the ranges as claimed in order to improve the movements of the brake cable system as suggested by common knowledge in the art.

10. Claims 27-34, 40, 41, 50-54, and 68-72 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant's reply must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37 CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).
12. Applicant's arguments filed December 18, 2003 (Paper No. 35) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

### CLAIM 1

Applicant contends that:

*The Applicant respectfully submits that sufficient shear failure force to break either the rod 40 or clip 45 of Wing cannot be generated. Applying tension to the front and rear cable strands 23, 14 will cause the rod to move along a deflector means, not break. "Pulling on the linkage with a force yet to be described will cause the rod to move along its axis on [a bent path defined by the deflector means]" (col. 2, lines 54-56).*

*In other words, as tension is applied to Wing's front and rear cables, the rod moves along a bent path to relieve the tension. Further, as shown in Fig. 3, the end of the rod 44 does not include any means for retaining the rod within the aforementioned bent path. Instead, if sufficient tension is applied to the cables, the rod will simply slip all the way along its axis and completely disengage from the deflector means. There is no breaking of either the rod 44 or clip 45 during operation. Prior to reaching any force sufficient to break either element, the force will disconnect the rod and clip from the linkage tensioner 25 (and associated deflector means). Since neither the rod nor the clip will break prior to disengaging the rod and clip from the deflector means, these elements cannot anticipate the "shear member" of claim 1. Accordingly, Wing is not a proper reference under § 102(b) against the invention of claim 1.*

At the outset, the examiner is mindful that the "wherein" clause in claim 1 of this application merely expresses an inherent result of the structures already recited in the body of the claims, *a fortiori*, it adds nothing to claim's patentability. *Texas Instruments, Inc. v. International Trade Commission*, 26 USPQ2d 1018 (CAFC 1993). Further, anticipation can occur when a

claimed limitation is “inherent” or otherwise implicit in the relevance reference. *Standard Haven Products, Inc. v. Gencor Industries, Inc.*, 21 USPQ2d 132, 1328 (CAFC 1991) and *In re Cruciferous Sprout Litigation*, 301 F.3d 1343, 64 USPQ2d 1202 (Fed. Cir. 2002). It is well settled that an anticipatory reference does not need to provide explanation about what artisan would know as evidenced by standard textbook. *In re Opprecht*, 12 USPQ2d 1235 (CAFC 1989). In addition, it is well settled that anticipation law requires distinction be made between invention described or taught and invention claimed. It does not require that the reference “teach” what subject patent application teaches, it is only necessary that the claim under attack, as construed by the Court, “*read on*” something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations of the claim are found in reference, or are “*fully met*” by it. *Kalman v. Kimberly Clark Corp.*, 218 USPQ 781, 789 (CAFC 1983).

The examiner respectfully submits that Wing’s shear member 40, 45 is inherently broken when one applies sufficient tension to the front and rear cable strands 23 and 14. The instant inherency is flown naturally from Wing’s teaching of substantially similar type of applicant’s park brake cable system as disclosed in column 1, lines 39-51, and claims 1-5. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977) and MPEP 2112. In fact, Wing’s Fig. 1 shows that when one applies a tension force to the cables 23 and 14, the cables 23 and 14 will oppose an equal reaction force to deform the shear member 40, 45 by well-known *Newton’s Third Law of Motion* in standard Physics textbooks. See, e.g., pages 87-90 of *Physics, Halliday Resnick* attached. Since Wing’s clip 45 or rod 40 is deformed, eventually, the clip 45 or rod 40 will be broken or cracked when the tension force applies a pressure on the clip 54 or rod 40 such that said pressure is greater than the yield strength of the material of which the clip 45 or rod 40 is made. See

column 3, lines 27-55, column 3, and Table 1-57 Mechanical Properties of Metal and Alloys attached. This factual evidence is explained in standard textbooks of material science, such as, pages 7.34-7.38 of *Standard Handbook of Machine Design* attached.

Second, applicant avers that:

*Additionally, even if either the clip or rod should somehow break during operation of Wing's invention, this breakage would not cause "the second end of the front cable strand... to maintain the continuous connection from the brake actuation lever to the brake assembly," as required by independent claim 1. Breaking either the clip or rod would completely disconnect the first cable 23 from the remainder of Wing's apparatus, and thus from the brake assemblies 11, 12. Should either the rod 44 or clip 40 fail, no connection would be present between the front cable strand and brake assemblies. Instead, such a connection is present only if Wing operates as disclosed, and neither element breaks. Accordingly, not only does Wing fail to anticipate the claimed connection between front cable and brake assembly upon failure of a shear member, it explicitly teaches away from such a connection due to its physical structure and operation. Thus, Wing cannot anticipate the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw his rejection and allow claim 1.*

Note that during patent examination, claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. It is proper to use the specification to interpret what the applicant meant by a word or phrase recited in the claim. However, it is not proper to read limitations appearing in the specification into the claim when these limitations are not recited in the claim. See *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1480, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1674 (Fed. Cir. 1994); and *IntervetAmerica Inc. v. Kee-Vet Lab. Inc.*, 887 F.2d 1050, 1053, 12 USPQ2d 1474, 1476 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The court states in *In re Zletz*, 983 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) that "claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow." The court further states, "[T]he terms used in the claims bear a 'heavy presumption' that they

mean what they say and have the ordinary meaning that would be attributed to those words by persons skilled in the relevant art.” *Texas Digital Systems Inc. v. Telegenix Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1193, 1202, 64 USPQ2d 1812, 1817 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

In the instant case, the examiner finds that applicant’s specification does not provide a special meaning to the term “break.” Therefore, the Examiner interprets the term “break” based on its customary and ordinary set forth in *Webster’s II New Riverside University Dictionary* (1994). Definition 2 of *Webster Dictionary* attached defines: “to break: to crack *without* separating into pieces” (emphasis added). Therefore, as long as the clip 45 or rod 44 is not separated into pieces, the force is still transmitted from the second end of the front cable strand 23 to maintain the continuous connection from the brake actuation lever 20 to the brake assembly 11 and 12 as claimed. In view of the fact that applicant’s claim 1 does not specifically call for a separating into pieces of the shear member, *a fortiori*, claim 1 is “fully met” by Wing because Wing’s device inherently performs the claimed function when the break is a minute crack.

Furthermore, in the above quotation, applicant admits that there is a possibility that the clip 45 or rod 44 somehow can be broken during operation of Wing’s invention. Plainly, depending on the size, shape, and/or location of the break or crack, the second end of Wing’s front cable strand 23 still can maintain the continuous connection from the brake actuation lever 20 to the brake assembly 11, 12. For example, if Wing’s clip 45 or rod 44 has only a microscopic crack at its first end at 47 in Fig. 3, the clip 45 or rod 44 still can connect the cables 23 and 14 to the brake system 11 and 12, consequently, the second end of Wing’s front cable

strand 23 still can maintain the continuous connection from the brake actuation lever 20 to the brake assembly 11, 12.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully maintained.

### **CLAIMS 45 & 63**

In the same vein of arguments, applicant asserts that:

*With respect to independent claims 45 and 63, the Applicant reiterates his argument made with respect to claim 1 regarding the inability of the rod 40 and clip 45 to break during Wing's operation. The Applicant further respectfully submits that, even if either the rod 40 or clip 45 could break during operation, such an event would sever the connection between the brake actuation lever and brake assembly. Wing provides no teaching or suggestion that either one of the second front cable end and first rear cable end would maintain such a continuous connection, as required by claim 45. Similarly, Wing provides no teaching or suggestion that the first end of the first rear cable strand may move to the second end of the connector clip when any alleged shear member breaks, thus maintaining a continuous connection from the brake actuation lever to the brake assembly (as required by claim 63). Should either the rod or clip somehow break, no cable strand moves as claimed in either claims 45 or 63. Further, given the aforementioned break, any connection between brake actuation lever and brake assembly necessarily is eliminated (see, for example, Fig. 3). There is simply no way to maintain such a connection without both clip and rod intact. Without some way to create a continuous connection once either the rod or clip breaks, Wing cannot serve as a § 102(b) reference against the inventions of claims 45 and 63.*

The examiner's response regarding the inability of the rod 40 and clip 45 to break during Wing's operation in claim 1 is similarly applied herein. Moreover, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the statement upon which applicant relies:

*Wing provides no teaching or suggestion that either one of the second front cable end and first rear cable end would maintain*

*such a continuous connection, as required by claim 45. Similarly, Wing provides no teaching or suggestion that the first end of the first rear cable strand may move to the second end of the connector clip when any alleged shear member breaks, thus maintaining a continuous connection from the brake actuation lever to the brake assembly (as required by claim 63). (Emphasis added).*

merely states an intended use. It is well settled law that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

On the other hand, as pointed out above, the term “break” is defined as “to crack *without* separating into pieces.” Therefore, when one applies the tension force to Wing’s cable such that one causes Wing’s shear member to have a break in the form of a microscopic crack, *either one of the second front cable end and first rear cable end would maintain such a continuous connection, as required by claim 45 or 63.* Applicant’s claims 45 and 63 are “fully met” by Wing because applicant’s term “break” is not specifically or narrowly defined to limit to the situation that the shear member is broken in separate pieces. *Kalman v. Kimberly Clark Corp.* *supra.* There is simply a way to maintain such a connection with both Wing’s clip and rod intact, i.e., by applying tension force to the cable strands such that the shear member has a crack instead of broken into separate pieces. With some way to create a continuous connection once either the rod or clip breaks, Wing transparently serves as a § 102(b) reference against the inventions of claims 45 and 63.

For the reasons stated above, the rejections of claims 45 and 63 (and claims 2, 22-26, 35-38, 46-49, 55, 60-62, 64-67, 73, 74, and 78-80) are likewise maintained.

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vinh T Luong whose telephone number is 703-308-3221. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bucci can be reached on 703-308-3668. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Luong

March 15, 2004



Vinh T. Luong  
Primary Examiner

# ATTACHMENT

